MINUTES OF MEETING OF COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 16 and 17, 1930.

The sixth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1930 was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on Thursday, January 16, and Friday, January 17, 1930.

The following members were present:

Mr. Moore, Chairman,
Mr. Garfield,
Mr. Morris,
Mr. Vitale,
Mr. Winter,
Mr. Cross,
Mr. Weinman,
also Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary and Executive Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The Minutes of the Meeting held December 12, 1929, were approved.

2. NC-4 MEDAL: Models were submitted by the Navy Department for the NC-4 Medal, designed by Miss Catherine G. Barton, 54 Franklin Street, Englewood, New Jersey. The models were brought to the particular attention of Mr. Weinman, and were examined also by the other members of the Commission.

Mr. Weinman said that Miss Barton desired to keep the design very simple but the Commission felt that the models should be improved artistically. Mr. Weinman made the following criticisms of the design: the sea gull on the obverse should now one foot in relief; the wing should be improved by having the feathers project as they would from various bones in the wing; also the tail should be improved. The lettering on the reverse should be improved with classical letters. The letters NC might be made a little smaller and the entire inscription around them should be drawn towards the center so as to give more space between the circles.

The Commission suggested that Mr. Weinman bring these matters to the attention of the artist. Mr. Weinman thereupon sent a telegram to Miss Barton for an appointment at his studio about the NC-4 Medal on January 30th.

3. MODEL FOR BALUSTRADE, CONNECTICUT AVENUE BRIDGE: Mr. C. P. Whyte, District Engineer of Bridges, submitted a model of a baluster for the new railing for the Connecticut Avenue Bridge, with letter as follows:

January 14, 1930.

"I am sending herewith for your consideration a plaster of paris model of the proposed baluster for the Connecticut Avenue Bridge, with a blue print of the railing.

You will recall that your commission approved the sketch last spring, but requested the submission of a full size model of the baluster."

The Commission inspected the model and noticed that it was much simpler than shown in the drawing. The Commission felt that the bulb was too thick and that more space should be given between the balusters. The Commission recommended that the bulb be reduced one inch in diameter. (Exhibit A)

4. BUST OF TECUMSEH: Under date of December 26, 1929, the following letter was received from Rear Admiral A. L. Willard, Commandant of the United States Navy Yard, regarding the bronze cast of the bust of Tecumseh:

"My dear Mr. Moore:

"Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of December 20th in regard to the statue of "Tecumseh", giving your suggestions in regard to the treatment of the bronze casting of the type of pedestal to be used. The information and suggestions contained in your letter are appreciated very much and I wish to thank you and the Commission for your kind interest in this matter.

I will discuss the question of the color to be given the casting when it is finished, by using the patina which you mentioned, with the other members of the class of 1891 and with the information which you have given us we should be able to come to a correct decision as to what should be done and if we find that we require the services of the man which you mentioned to assist us in making the patina I will communicate with Mr. Weinman.

I also note that the Commission strongly recommend the granite pedestal and that Mr. Weinman suggests the use of a pink granite. I will discuss this also with our class and see what steps can be taken to finance the purchase of the granite pedestal.

"I am enclosing herewith the following pictures and sketches identified as indicated:

(A) Photograph of wooden statue on the pedestal as was used at the Naval Academy.

(B) Photograph of statue on temporary wooden pedestal as viewed by the Commission at the Naval Gun Factory. (The height of this pedestal is 10" less than the one used at the Naval Academy).

(C-1, 2, 3) Photographs of wooden pedestal with straight sides (C-1 is 70" in height and the same as (A). C-2 is 68" in height, and C-3 is 66" in height.

(D-1, 2, 3) Photographs showing temporary wooden pedestal with tapered sides of same height as shown in the "C" photographs

(E) Three diagrammatic sketches showing dimensions of pedestal as indicated on the sketches.

"I would be very glad if you would discuss the shape and dimensions of the pedestal as shown on the above mentioned enclosures with Mr. Weinman and other members of the Commission and give me your views as to which pedestal you think would be preferable and also whether any changes should be made in the shape or dimensions of the pedestal. The over all height of the statue itself including the wooden lock attached to the figure is 93".

"You will note that the pedestal which you saw in the Gun Factory is 60" in height which is 10" less than the height of the pedestal heretofore used. Mr. Weinman suggests that the height of the pedestal which you saw be increased about 10" which happens to bring it up to just the same height of the pedestal used at the Academy and as shown in the pictures numbered C-1 and D-1. Personally I think that this height of 70" for the pedestal seems to be about correct.

"You will note that the width of the pedestal in both the straight and tapered sides is 36½" at a point 8" below the top. It might be desirable to increase this width two or three inches making corresponding changes in the other dimensions. I will be glad to have your opinion on this point.

"We appreciate very much the interest shown by you and the other members of the Commission in this matter and it was very kind indeed of you all to come down to the Navy Yard to study the design and give us the benefit of your opinions, and any further suggestions you may give us as indicated above will be of much assistance towards our carrying out the plan of casting in bronze the figurehead of the "Delaware" and placing it at the Naval Academy.

"With kindest regards to you and the other members of the Commission of Fine Arts, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

H. L. Willard,
Rear Admiral, U. S. N.,
Commandant and Superintendent,
Naval Gun Factory."

The letter and photographs were brought to the particular attention of Mr. Weinman, who recommended a change in the pedestal to give it better proportion. The architect members of the Commission thereupon gave the question of pedestal special consideration. With a view to determining upon the proper size of the pedestal, Mr. Cross asked that he be furnished with the dimensions of the base and the overall dimensions of the Tecumseh bust. Rear Admiral Willard was informed accordingly. (Exhibit B)

5. CLOCK IN FRONT OF THE UNION STATION: Under date of December 26, 1929, the following letter was received from Dr. John C. Merriam, President of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, suggesting a clock on the facade of the Union Station, [illegible]

> "It has several times occurred to me to inquire whether it would not be possible to put a clock somewhere on the front of the Union Station without in any way diminishing the architectural effectiveness of the building. After moving back and forth to endless trains for ten years and watching the multitudes of others who do the same, it has seemed to me that a reasonable assurance as to the element of time would be a tremendous boon to the public.
>
> I am merely sending this note for what it may be worth, feeling that you will know how the matter should be treated."

The matter was brought to the attention of the architects, Graham, Anderson, Probst and White, (the successors of the D. H. Burnham Company), for their advice in the matter, and they replied as follows:

January 10, 1930.

> "Replying to your letter of January 8th, requesting our opinion of placing a clock on the Union Station Washington, I wish to advise that we feel a monumental clock of sufficient size to be of use to the public would be a disturbing element in the architecture. It is possible, however, to design a clock suspended in the central archway of the main facade, also at each end at the outer arch of the cabstands. We would like to give this further thought.
>
> E. P. Graham"

The Commission felt that a clock on the facade would be useful but questioned the advisability of disturbing the facade. Mr. Moore called

attention to the fact that there is a clock on the facade of the Pennsylvania Railroad Station and on the facade of the Grand Central Station, New York City. It was decided to await further reply from the architects in Chicago.

6. SALVATION ARMY BUILDING: Under date of January 7, 1930, the following letter was received from Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d, Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital, bringing to the attention of the Commission a suggested plan for a new Salvation Army Building, at 6th and E Streets, Northwest:

> "The inclosed pamphlet shows a design for a new Salvation Army building, which is not very promising in the matter of appearance. I sent it to Mr. Peaslee, thinking that his local Advisory Committee of Architects might be ready to take up the subject of this design with the Salvation Army, but he states that, after consultation with the Chairman of the Committee, 'he does not think that the Chapter would be as effective as the Fine Arts Commission in dealing with this particular situation'.
>
> The matter is brought to your attention for such action as you think appropriate. Personally I hesitate very much to intervene, because the location of the building would not be within the purview of the Shipstead bill and I have already caused the Salvation Army considerable trouble in my efforts to prevent their putting this building on the old site, where they originally intended it to stand."

The secretary stated that he talked with Major James Usher, Divisional Commander of the Washington Headquarters, 426 Sixth Street, N.W., who stated that no architect's plans for the building have been made and that it is a project that has thus far simply been mentioned and included in their program of development, and one that very probably would not be carried out until some time in the distant future. It is one of 9 items in the Southern Extension Program for the District of Columbia.

7. NEW RAILING ON THE BRIDGE AT DUN-SUR-MEUSE, FRANCE: In behalf of the American Battle Monuments Commission, Mr. James J. Mangum, Executive Assistant, submitted "Plans presented by the Veterans of the Fifth Division for a new railing on the bridge at Dun-sur-Meuse, France, which has been approved by the American Battle Monuments Commission.

The Commission noted that the plans had been made by Lahalle and Levard, architects, of Paris. The Commission selected a simple sketch (marked E) showing intersecting diamonds for the grille work, with a star at the points of intersection. (Exhibit C)

8. SOLDIER'S MEDAL, WAR DEPARTMENT: Capt. Franklin D. Shawn, and Mr. Arthur E. DuBois, of the Quartermaster General's Office, appeared before the Commission and requested advice as to the proposed Soldier's Medal.

The secretary stated that under date of December 26, 1929, the following letter was received from Major General E. E. Cheatham, the Quartermaster General, U.S.A.:

> "This Office has been authorized to expend a sum not to exceed $1,500. for the services of an artist who shall submit a design for the Soldier's Medal, which will be acceptable to the Commission of Fine Arts and the War Department.
>
> It is requested that you indicate by letter the names of such medallists as are capable to produce a work of art that will be satisfactory to your Commission so that this office may proceed with the securing of the design."

The secretary stated that under date of December 31st the matter was brought to the attention of Mr. Weinman, who recommended three artists, and that on January 11, 1930, the following letter was sent to General Cheatham:

> "In accordance with your request of December 26th, the Commission of Fine Arts recommend the following three medallists, from whom to select one, any one of whom would produce a work of art in designing the proposed Soldier's Medal:
>
> Charles L. Hinton, 74 Gard Avenue, Armour Villa Park, Bronxville, New York,
> Ulric H. Ellerhusen, 939 Eighth Avenue, New York City,
> Gaetano Cecere, 412 West 53d Street, New York City.
>
> If a limited competition is required, a pen and ink sketch for the obverse and the reverse (indicating the inscription to be required) may be secured from the three artists above mentioned, and submitted to the Commission."

Capt. Shawn thereupon read the draft of a letter which is to be sent to each of these artists, inviting them to submit a design.

The Commission suggested that the artists be furnished with prints of existing Army medals for their guidance, and the letter was amended accordingly (Exhibit D).

9. LEIF ERICKSON STATUE: The secretary stated that letters were continually being received recommending that a sculptor of Icelandic or Scandinavian descent be selected to design the monument to Leif Ericsson. One received from Mr. Oskar J. Hansen, Sculptor, of Chicago, was read, which in part states:

> "There is, contrary to common belief, an art inherent to the Norse people of the period of Leif Erickson. There are factors which compel attention where any monument hankening back to that period is concerned. Stone Henge at Land's End in England is but one of several such dignified aggregations of stone found throughout the Scandinavian peninsula. The arrangement of the runic writing upon some of these stones in Norway compare very favourably in spacing and general artistic composition with the very finest of the early pyramid period of Egypt. Some of the designs from Scandinavia and Iceland of this period carry a very individual, but still a very reminiscent flavour of the designs of 800 to 550 Attic Greece."

The Commission considered the matter, and decided they would adhere to the recommendation they submitted to the Department of State that A. Stirling Calder, Sculptor, be designated for making the Leif Ericsson statue.

The secretary thereupon said that he received a report by telephone a moment ago from the Department of State to the effect that Congress has passed a special appropriation Act of $50,000, of which sum the Department has set aside $47,500 to produce the monument; that advice was requested as to the next step to be taken, and he suggested that the Department of State draw up a tentative draft of a contract with A. Stirling Calder, thereupon it should be submitted to the Commission. The Commission concurred in this suggestion. Mr. Weinman, being asked how much time Mr. Calder should have to produce the statue, replied at least one and one-half years; Mr. Wittle suggested two years.

(The tentative draft of the contract was sent to Mr. Calder Jan.25,1930)

10. FORT SUMTER MEMORIAL FLAGPOLE: Under date of January 15, 1930, the following letter was received from Simons and Lapham, architects, 43 Broad Street, Charleston, S.C., regarding the Fort Sumter Memorial Flagpole:

"We have at last received authorization from Mr. Coleman to forward to him the contracts for the monument at Fort Sumter and this has been done. So, we shortly hope to have this project actively under way.

With regard to the stone work, we have had letters from several stone contractors asking to figure on this work and we are uncertain whether it was your wish to have Mt. Airy granite by the North Carolina Granite Corporation used exclusively or whether you would accept Mt. Airy granite by any other granite corporation than the North Carolina Granite Corporation. We would like to be advised as to this point so that we may pass the information on to those making inquiry of us.

It was our understanding at first that it was your wish to have the North Carolina Granite Corporation both furnish the Mt. Airy granite and do the work. You recommended them highly in your letter of July 2nd but their actions have been rather strange since they made you the figure in as much as they first claimed to the contractors that their price did not include the lettering, although this was shown on the design. This matter we let pass, notifying you of the matter in our letter of July 25th. Recently, when just previous to the signing of the contracts, they were asked to confirm their figure, they replied that they had figured on eight cut work instead of ten cut. We did not stand for this inasmuch as it was distinctly marked on the drawings that ten cut work was expected so we stuck to our point and they finally admitted that they would furnish ten cut work for the price. These two occurenaces did not impress us favorably with the integrity of the firm to stand by its figures so we are taking the matter up with you. Should, however, you wish both the material and the work done by them and feel that they are satisfactory to the Art Commission, we will not consult any other bidders. We shall be glad to be advised on this pointm as soon as possible."

Mr. Weinman said he knew that some years ago this corporation did not do such excellent carving and cited instances of work done by them in New York City where their work at that time was not satisfactory. Mr. Moore said that since the North Carolina Granite Corporation has had the contract to supply the Mount Airy Granite for the Arlington Memorial Bridge, in huge quantities, they have entirely re-equipped their plant to bring it up-to-date, and that they now have very good stone cutters, as is shown by the buffalo heads and fasces on the bridge. Also it is expected they will cut the eagles very soon. The

question of cutting the lettering Mr. Moore said he wished to [illegible] with the company at once, since McKim, Mead and White are to design the letters.

Mr. Hose, sculptor, of Washington, was in conference with Mr. Weinman as to preparing the medallion of Major Anderson for the base of the flagpole. A draft of a contract was examined by them, and upon the recommendation of Mr. Weinman the following provision was also included in it:

> "Upon suggestion of the Commission of Fine Arts, the sculptor hereby agrees to supervise the carving of the portrait of Major Anderson at such a place where it is brought to completion, and the Architects of the Memorial hereby agree that his acceptance of the carving shall be final."

The Commission concurred in this.

11. GREAT PLAZA FOR THE TRIANGLE: Mr. Morris said that members of the Board of Architectural Consultants of the Treasury Department had asked about the Plan for the Great Plaza and that they seemed to feel that the Commission of Fine Arts had not taken definite action in the matter. Mr. Morris said he was under the impression that the Commission had done so, and Mr. Moore said that this was true as a letter from the Commission to Mr. Bennett, Chairman of the Board, will show. This was dated November 20, 1929, and at the request of the Chairman the secretary secured a copy of it and read it (Exhibit E).

Mr. Morris said the letter certainly is specific. Mr. Moore stated on Friday morning that Mr. Wm. Adams Delano had informed him that Secretary Mellon expects to hold a meeting of the Board of Architectural Consultants on February 10th, and the question of whether the Commission of Fine Arts would meet in New York City that day (as had been decided upon) or meet with the Board in Washington, was to be decided definitely during the next few days.

12. MERIDIAN HILL PARK: Mr. H. W. Peaslee, architect, presented a model

for the treatment of the space near the Grand Terrace and certain parts of the Upper and Lower Garden, of Meridian Hill Park. The Commission discussed the matter with Mr. Peaslee, and offered several suggestions, concurring also in others made by Mr. Vitale during a personal inspection of the park. These were embodied in a letter Mr. Peaslee sent to Lieut. Col. Grant Ed, Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks, with the suggestion for a further conference on the subject. (Exhibit F).

13. ADDITIONAL CABINS FOR THE TOURIST CAMP, EAST POTOMAC PARK: Under date of December 19, 1929, the following letter was received from Mr. Jefferson L. Fort, Jr., 910 E Street, N.W., who is President of the District of Columbia Hotel Association, protesting against the erection of additional cabins in the Tourist Camp of East Potomac Park:

> "As president of the District of Columbia Hotel Association, I have the privilege of enclosing herewith a copy of resolutions unanimously approved by the District of Columbia Hotel Association at their regular meeting held on the evening of December 6 at the Hamilton Hotel, in Washington. The enclosure, I believe, will prove self-explanatory.
>
> We are counting on your strong cooperation and support in the fight our Association is making in opposition to the proposed erection of tourist cabins in East Potomac Park, D.C. Our problem in Washington is a general one, applying also to various parts of the country, and hotel men throughout the United States will be interested in our endeavors to prevent further encroachment upon our industry through the extension of the tourist cabin evil.
>
> We should be delighted to have you attend one of the meetings of the District of Columbia Hotel Association. Your presence would be an inspiration, and your helpful advice thoroughly appreciated."

The Resolution reads in part as follows:-- "Be it further resolved, That the Fine Arts Commission be commended for their skillful and zealous attention to the proper development of the National Capital along approved symmetrical and artistic lines in general, and for their opposition to the proposed erection of forty unsightly tourist cabins in addition to the facilities already afforded tourists in East Potomac Park in particular;--"

The secretary said that he had talked with Col. Grant about the matter,

who had stated that the cabins are temporary structures and that the Tourist Camp is not being enlarged. The Commission felt that it would be better to develop East Potomac Park, according to the approved plan for a great playground, but that until money is made available for this a few additional cabins would not make any particular difference. An inspection trip through the Tourist Camp was made by the Commission on Friday afternoon. The Commission felt that the Tourist Camp should be removed from that part of the city at the earliest opportunity and a site for it secured adjacent to the District Line.

14. ROCKVILLE COURT HOUSE: Plans were received recently for the new Court House at Rockville, Md., submitted by Capt. Chester Wells, U.S.N., Chairman of the Sub-Committee of the Building Committee. The plans were submitted to Mr. Garfield, who advised that the building was not designed in good proportion, and suggested in connection with a restudy an early 19th century building.

The matter was brought to the attention of Capt. Wells, who thereupon requested a conference of his subcommittee, consiting of two additional members, Dr. Gilbert Grosvenor, President of the National Geographic Society, and Mr. George E. Hamilton, Jr., a prominent attorney of this city, with the Commission.

Capt. Wells, Dr. Grosvenor, and Mr. Hamilton appeared before the Commission accordingly for a conference in regard to the plans. The question with them was as to the next step to be taken in the matter,--whether the Commission would approve the plans, subject to certain minor changes; or whether the plans should be placed in the hands of another architect.

Mr. Garfield said that this morning Mr. Delos H. Smith, 1707 I Street, N.W., had spoken to him over the telephone about the plans and fully concurred in what he had said about them; also that, as to the cost of the building, Mr. Smith was certain it would be $1.00 a foot instead of 50 cents as estimated by Mr. Ross Mitchell, the architect who had drawn the plans. Mr. Garfield said

further that Mr. Smith is an experienced architect who could well take the plans in hand, and in cooperation with Mr. Mitchell make changes that will improve the design.

As was noted in the design, Captain Wells said Mr. Mitchell thought he was planning a building similar to the Treasury Department Building, and the numerous bays shown in the design were there because the occupants want all the light possible.

Mr. Morris said that the building is not so bad in design but what it can be improved. Mr. Morris said it was forced in scale, and then gave a technical interpretation of this term as used among architects,--"the scale of a building, what we call scale, is a word difficult to describe. It is the relationship of parts and their size and relative use one with another.

"This design represents a mistaken scale. The units of design in the proposed building should be bigger. The column spacing is a little close, so it works out this way. The main entrance of the building shows the door measuring 3' 6", which for public buildings is inadequate. There are devices by which that could be increased. What the architect has there is a good building in miniature. There is a question as to what degree it is out of scale, how much you can enlarge on features of the design without increasing the bulk."

Mr. Morris said personally that the architects could be paid for all his work, including working drawings (which Captain Wells said are 90% completed) and on the whole the County could still save money. The other members of the Commission felt the same way about the matter,--a good design for a building being a saving in the long run because it produces a building that is satisfactory.

Dr. Grosvenor said the Building Committee has been very desirous of having a limestone building, instead of a brick building. The Commission interposed

no objection to this. The legislature has appropriated $428,000 for the building.

Mr. Hamilton thereupon spoke generally of the project, with particular reference to the preparation of the design and the interior arrangement. Mr. Hamilton said the present sub-committee has just been called upon to secure the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts as to the plans; that the work has been going on for two years, during which all those who expected an office in the building told Mr. Mitchell how much space they wanted. Space has been allowed for Court Chambers. Mr. Hamilton said, "thus the kernel has been prepared, and the exterior designed to fit it". Mr. Hamilton (who is professor of Legal Ethics at the Georgetown University Law School) said that he regards a court house a Temple of Justice, and does not think ordinary county offices belong in it. Also he objected to having a jail in the court house, as shown in the design.

Mr. Morris said, as to the matter of locating a jail in the court house, that he could say from experience in building designs for jails in New York that this is becoming a favored plan; there is usually a private passageway leading to the jail, which is a safeguard to the public, and makes it less difficult for prisoners to escape. To have the jail in a separate building might be desirable but it makes it difficult to bring prisoners back and forth.

After further discussion it was decided that Mr. Delos Smith should be chosen associate architect in charge of the building plans, with Mr. Mitchell, and that these two architects should study the problem of improving the design, after further conference with the Rockville Court House Building Committee.

Col. Grant, who was present, said the National Capital Park and Planning Commission did not altogether favor the location selected for the building, but he thought possibly it was too late to change this. Mr. Hamilton said it was,--

that the building will be on the main highway from Rockville to Washington, and it was for this reason the subcommittee wished to have the matter brought before the Commission of Fine Arts, so as to relate the building to the Greater Washington Plan. Only a part of the building is to be built for the present,

15. L'ENFANT MEMORIAL: Attention was called to the efforts of the L'Enfant Memorial Association, with headquarters in Washington, to erect a suitable Memorial to L'Enfant in the National Capital. Mr. Moore said that certain citizens of the State of Pennsylvania have suggested a great fountain near the Triangle or in the Mall as an appropriate memorial to him; also that representatives of the L'Enfant Memorial Association had recently asked for a draft of a Bill that could be introduced in Congress by Hon. Hamilton Fish, Jr., who is interested in the project, and that such draft has been furnished (Exhibit G).

16. MUNICIPAL CENTER: Mr. A. E. Harris, Municipal Architect, in company with Mr. Edward V. Donn, Jr., Prof. Murphy, architect, School of Architecture of the Catholic University, and Mr. Nathan C. Wyeth, architect, appeared before the Commission with a suggested plan for a change in the Municipal Center development.

The Commission inspected the plan and noted in particular that it involved a change in the line of the proposed Avenue from Union Station, bringing it nearer to Four-and-a-half Street, and a large plaza scheme to the south, in front of the Municipal Center, between Third and Sixth Streets, extending across the Mall about 2,000 feet, by about 800 feet east and west. Mr. Harris said the architects present who are associated in the study of the scheme felt it would give a more symmetrical plan for the Municipal Center and a better frontage.

The Commission, after consideration of the elements involved, felt that

this

there was no good reason why Mr. Harris should change the plan heretofore adopted for the Municipal Center; that such plan has been adopted by Congress, as also the plan for Enlargement of the Capitol Grounds and developing Union Station Plaza, and for the development of the Mall. In the opinion of the Commission there was no considerable advantage to be derived from adopting the proposed scheme. But before expressing a definite opinion it was decided that the plan should be referred to Mr. Wm. E. Parsons, Landscape Architect, of Chicago, who had prepared the plans for the Union Station Plaza and Capitol Grounds development, under the direction of Mr. David Lynn, Architect of the Capitol.

It so happened that Mr. Parsons was in Washington on Friday to participate in the Annual Convention of the American Society of Landscape Architects, and while at the Capitol telephoned that he was there talking with Mr. Lynn about the Capitol Grounds Plans. The secretary informed Mr. Parsons that the Commission was in session and would be pleased to call on him and Mr. Lynn at the Capitol about noon as to this proposed Municipal Center plan. Arrangements were so made.

The Commission, in conference with Mr. Parsons and Mr. Lynn, called attention to the projects affected. Mr. Vitale said, as he had done before the Commission,at the Commission Rooms, that the plaza scheme proposed by Mr. Harris was out of all proportions and would seriously affect the Plan of the Mall. It was shown to be twice as large as the Place de la Concorde.

Mr. Parsons, after inspecting the plan, said he fully concurred in the views of the Commission,-that the plaza plan of Mr. Harris would ruin the Union Square plan at the head of the Mall, and it would cause serious changes in the Union Station Plaza plan. Mr. Lynn said he could not consent to the proposed change at this late date, since the estimates have been submitted;Congress has adopted the Municipal Center scheme, the Plan for Union Station Plaza and

the development of the Mall, and that any change now would require the presentation of the entire matter again before Committees of Congress and new legislation by Congress. It would mean very serious delays to the projects.

Mr. Moore said that Mr. Harris is overlooking an important matter in failing to place emphasis on the Indiana-Louisiana Avenues frontage, facing the District Court House and Judiciary Square; that the first of the new Municipal Center buildings will face those Avenues and ultimately it will be the main entrance to the Municipal Center.

After discussion the Commission decided to adhere to the plans for the Municipal Center heretofore approved, which provide for developing the four squares between Third and Sixth Streets, Pennsylvania Avenue on the south, and Indiana and Louisiana Avenues on the north. The secretary was requested to inform Mr. Harris accordingly, and did so while at the Capitol.

It was understood that the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, to whom Mr. Harris wished to present the plans during the afternoon, were also opposed to the change proposed by Mr. Harris.

17. ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE: Mr. Moore stated that in view of funds reported to be needed for completing all the work on the Arlington Memorial Bridge and the fact that the Highway connection at the north end of Columbia Island is not such as to require the proposed bridge from the island to the Virginia mainland at present, he had suggested to Col. Grant that the construction of this bridge be held in abeyance until some time in the future.

Mr. Moore said that he had heard from Mr. Kendall that he had modified the plans for the brick bridge so as to affect a saving of from $50,000 to $50,000, but to postpone building the bridge would save about $400,000. The Commission concurred: that if there is no actual need for the bridge at this

time there is no need for spending all this money on it, and it had better be used to complete details of the Memorial Bridge proper,--as erecting the great columns on Columbia Island and the sculpture for Columbia Island Plaza, and providing a suitable terminal at the entrance to Arlington, with a fountain.

Col. Grant, having been informed of the approval of the design of this Memorial Entrance to Arlington by the Commission at the December meeting, replied as follows:

January 16, 1930.

"I hereby acknowledge receipt of your note of December 28,1929. It only seems to be necessary to note, in connection with the change from an equestrian statue to a fountain as the principal feature of the memorial entrance, that the original approved estimates included no funds for this statue, since it was supposed that it would be donated as a special item. The fountain will, therefore, constitute an additional new item of expense. However, allow me to add by personal entire concurrence with this change, which I feel will be very much more attractive and more unusual. The equestrian statue suggestion has always seemed to me unfortunate as being very obvious and also raising considerable question as to whose statue should go there. The fountain may be a very attractive and not frequently repeated feature about Washington."

Col. Grant also reported that the question of holding the construction of the bridge above mentioned in abeyance would be given very careful consideration by the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission.

18. MOUNT VERNON HIGHWAY: The Commission inspected, at the Mechanical Shops of the Department of Agriculture, a model of the Mount Vernon Highway as it is to pass the south end of the Highway Bridge, and under the Southern Railroad Bridge, and also a model for the Mount Vernon Terminal. Each of these models were about 20 feet square. Mr. L. E. Toms, Engineer of the Bureau of Public Roads, immediately in charge of the project, was present, as also Major Gilmore D. Clarke, Landscape Architect, of the Bronx Parkway, who designed the bridges for the Mount Vernon Highway and the lamp standard, which the Commission have approved.

The Commission inspected the models with much interest. The model for the Washington end of the Highway showed that two spans would be taken from the Highway Bridge, cutting off about 425 feet. The model showed a two-way roadway from Washington to Alexandria and one 40 foot driveway from Alexandria to Mount Vernon. Mr. Toms said the Highway will in due time supersede the existing suburban line from Washington to Mount Vernon, with bus service.

The Mount Vernon Terminal model showed a terminal building with the Highway leading to it, and space for parking fully 2500 automobiles. The model represented an area comprising one-fourth of a mile square, and was designed to conform to natural contours.

The Commission were much pleased with these models. Certain landscape features are to be added to them. Mr. Toms said every effort would be made to have the Mount Vernon Highway completed in time for the George Washington Bicentennial Celebration in 1932.

The Commission had as their guests at luncheon on Thursday Mr. Frederic Keppel, President of the Carnegie Foundation, New York City, and Mr. Carlm Rose, Sculptor. In the evening the Commission were the guests of the American Society of Landscape Architects, at the Annual Banquet at the Hotel Willard, where Mr. Vitale gave an Address on the Washington Monument Gardens.

On Friday noon the Commission had luncheon with Mr. Parsons at the Capitol, and in the afternoon made an inspection trip through South Washington, the Army War College Grounds, the Tourist Camp and East Potomac Park, the Arlington Memorial Bridge Plaza at the Lincoln Memorial and the Rock Creek Parkway connection, Meridian Hill Park, and Sixteenth Street Heights, where the road has been paved to the District Line and connects with the road westward to Connecticut Avenue. In the evening the Commission were guests of the American Civic Association at dinner at the Cosmos Club, and later in the evening attended the meeting on Greater Washington, under auspices of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, at which Col. Grant, Governor Ritchie of Maryland, and Governor Pollard of Virginia were the principal speakers.

COPY

January 16, 1930.

Dear Mr. Whyte:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on January 16, 1930, inspected the model of the baluster, submitted by you, for the new railing of the Connecticut Avenue Bridge.

The Commission noticed, with favor, that the model is simpler in design than that suggested in the drawing heretofore considered. However, the Commission regard the bulb too thick and recommend that it be reduced one inch in diameter. This will give a little more space between the balusters and will improve the appearance of the balustrade.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mr. C. E. Whyte,
Engineer of Bridges of
the District of Columbia,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT A

COPY

January 20, 1930.

Dear Admiral Willard:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on January 16th, were pleased to give consideration to your letter of December 20th and the photographs submitted of the bust of Tecumseh. In order that the proper size of the pedestal may be definitely determined, the Commission wish to be advised as to the base and overall dimensions of the Tecumseh bust.

Very respectfully, yours,

C. H. Cramer,

Secretary and Executive Officer.

Rear Admiral L. R. Willard, U. S. N.,

Commandant, United States Navy Yard,

Washington, D.C.

ENCLOSURE B

COPY

January 18, 1950.

Dear Sirs:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on January 13, 1950, considered the sketches submitted by you for a new railing on the bridge at Pont-sur-Mouse. The Commission regarded the sketches very interesting and approved the one marked (x).

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

The American Battle Monuments Commission,

Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT C

COPY TO: The Commission of Fine Arts.

Similar letters have been written to the following artists:
Ulric H. Ellerhausen, 939 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Gaetano Cecere, 412 West 33d St., New York, N. Y.
7 incls. (as listed in letter.)

QM 421 S-C
Soldier's Medal.

January 20, 1930.

Mr. Charles Hinton,
74 Gard Avenue,
Armour Villa Park,
Bronxville, New York.

Dear Sir:

In accordance with the following quoted Act approved July 2, 1926, the War Department desires to obtain an appropriate design for a Soldier's Medal:

"An Act To provide more effectively for the national defense by increasing the efficiency of the Air Corps of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes.

. . . . . .

"Sec. 11. Under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe the President is hereby authorized to present, but not in the name of Congress, a medal to be known as the soldier's medal, of appropriate design, with accompanying ribbon, to any person who, while serving in any capacity with the Army of the United States, including the National Guard and the Organized Reserves, shall hereafter distinguish himself, or herself, by heroism not involving actual conflict with an enemy. . . . "

The medal should not exceed the size of any of the present military decorations as illustrated by enclosed photographs, which are actual size. The medal is to be struck from bronze, preferably of a shape other than a disk; the disk form as illustrated by the photograph of the Victory Medal is reserved for service medals. Designs are desired for the obverse and reverse with a suitable space left on the reverse for engraving the individual name, rank, and date. The edge is to be wide enough to take a serial number.

There is also enclosed a copy of Army Regulations No. 600-35, December 31, 1926, All the United States military decorations except the Distinguished Flying Cross are described in paragraphs 23 to 25 inclusive, while the service medals are described in paragraphs 29 to 41 inclusive.

You have been suggested by the Commission of Fine Arts, under date of January 11, 1930, as one who may be interested in furnishing a design and from whom this office should request design or designs.

REPLY TO: The Commission of Fine Arts.

Similar letters have been written to the following architects:
Ulric H. Ellerhusen, 539 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Gaetano Cecere, 412 East 53d St., New York, N. Y.
7 inols. (as listed in letter.)

CM 421 S-C
Soldier's Medal.

January 20, 1930.

Mr. Charles Winton,
74 Card Avenue,
Almont Villa Park,
Bronxville, New York.

Dear Sir:

In accordance with the following quoted Act approved July 2, 1926, the War Department desires to obtain an appropriate design for a Soldier's Medal:

"An Act To provide more effectively for the national defense by increasing the efficiency of the Air Corps of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes.

. . . . . .

"Sec. 11. Under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe the President is hereby authorized to present, but not in the name of Congress, a medal to be known as the soldier's medal, of appropriate design, with accompanying ribbon, to any person who, while serving in any capacity with the Army of the United States, including the National Guard and the Organized Reserves, shall hereafter distinguish himself, or herself, by heroism not involving actual conflict with an enemy. . . . "

The medal should not exceed the size of any of the present military decorations as illustrated by enclosed photographs, which are actual size. The medal is to be struck from bronze, preferably of a shape of or that is disk; the disk form as illustrated by the photograph of the Victory Medal is reserved for service medals. Designs are desired for the obverse and reverse with a suitable space left on the reverse for engraving the individual name, rank, and date. The edge is to be wide enough to take a serial number.

There is also enclosed a copy of Army Regulations No. 600-35, December 31, 1926. All the United States military decorations except the Distinguished Flying Cross are described in paragraphs 25 to 35 inclusive, while the service medals are described in paragraphs 36 to 41 inclusive.

You have been suggested by the Commission of Fine Arts, under date of January 11, 1930, as one who may be interested in furnishing a design and from whom this office should request designs or designs.

The designs should be either in natural size or enlargements in the form of pen and ink sketches, and should be forwarded to the Office of The Quartermaster General, Room 2215, Munitions Building, Washington, D. C., marked "Attention: Chief, Clothing and Equipage Division," on or before February 28, 1930. Such sketches will be submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts for the selection of design considered to be most appropriate, subject to the approval of the Secretary of War.

If a sketch submitted by you is selected and approved, as indicated above, you will be expected as a condition of award to enter into formal contract with the Contracting Officer, Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot, Twenty-first Street and Oregon Avenue, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, for the delivery, with all transportation charges prepaid, of a suitable model or cast of appropriate material which will be an accurate treatment in relief of such design from which suitable manufacturing dies may be made. When submitting designs, statement should be made as to the estimated length of time required to furnish the model or cast.

Such minor changes or corrections to the design as may be necessitated by the purpose for which the design is intended, may be the subject of adjustment between the artist and the Office of The Quartermaster General, or the Commission of Fine Arts.

For an approved design in the form of sketches and model or cast as indicated, the War Department will pay not exceeding the sum of fifteen hundred dollars ($1,500.00). Upon payment of this sum, all rights to the design, sketch, model or cast, will belong exclusively to the United States.

No payment whatever will be made except for such approved design properly modelled or cast.

It is hoped that you will submit a design or designs in pursuance of the foregoing.

Very truly yours,

H. F. REITHERS,
Brigadier General, Q.M.C.,
Acting The Quartermaster General.

7 incls.
Incls. 1-6 -6Photographs.
Incls 7 -AR 600-35, 12/31/261

EXHIBIT D

QM 421 S-6 Soldier's Medal, letter, 1-20-39, cont'd.

The designs should be clear in general size or enlargements in the form of pen and ink sketches, and should be forwarded to the Office of the Quartermaster General, Room 2216, Munitions Building, Washington, D. C., marked "Attention: Chief, Clothing and Equipage Division," on or before February 28, 1939. Such sketches will be submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts for the selection of designs considered to be most appropriate, subject to the approval of the Secretary of War.

If a sketch submitted by you is selected and approved, as indicated above, you will be expected as a condition of award to enter into formal contract with the Government, Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot, Twenty-first Street and Oregon Avenue, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, for the delivery, with all transportation charges prepaid, of a suitable model or cast of appropriate material which will be an accurate treatment in relief of such design from which suitable manufacturing dies may be made. When submitting to Fairmah the model or cast.

Such minor changes or corrections to the design as may be necessitated by the purpose for which the design is intended, may be the subject of adjustment between the artist and the Office of the Quartermaster General, or the Commission of Fine Arts.

For an approved design in the form of sketches and model or cast as indicated, the War Department will pay not exceeding the sum of fifteen hundred dollars ($1,500.00). Upon payment of this sum, all rights to the design, sketch, model or cast, will belong exclusively to the United States.

No payment whatever will be made except for such approved cast in properly modelled or cast.

It is hoped that you will submit a design or designs in pursuance of the foregoing.

Very truly yours,

[illegible]
Brigadier General, U.S.A.,
Acting The Quartermaster General.

Incls 7 -AR 600-35, 12/31/31.
Incls. 1-6 -Photographs.
7 incls.

COPY

November 20, 1929.

Dear Mr. Bennett:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on November 18, 1929, considered the revised design submitted for the treatment of the east end of the Great Plaza, opposite the Department of Commerce Building, in the Triangle.

You will recall that the Commission expressed a clear and distinct recommendation in favor of the simple treatment of the eastern end of the Plaza, as shown in the designs before the Commission at the meeting on September 11, 1929. The Commission then said that, if the Board of Architectural Consultants still desired a more ornate treatment of that end of the Plaza, the Commission would consider a revised scheme of a pediment. The revised scheme presented with your letter of November 15th has been examined with great care and it is the unanimous opinion of the Commission of Fine Arts that it is not a satisfactory solution of the problem. The Commission advise, therefore, a return to the simple treatment and the development thereof.

One of the considerations was the fact that the building itself is designed to house the Independent Offices, clearly subordinate activities of the Government. The building designed would lead one to expect it to be one of the great Departments of the Government, and even then the treatment seems over elaborate. In some respects the changes that have been made in the design rather detract, notably in the flanking pavilions, which are not as satisfactory as in the original design, although the center has been modified. The Commission, therefore, found the design as submitted unsatisfactory and disapprove it.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mr. E. H. Bennett, Chairman,
Board of Architectural Consultants,
Office of the Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT B

RECEIVED
FINE ARTS COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS,
WASHINGTON, D. C.
JAN 23 1930
NOTED

January 22, 1930.

Col. U.S. Grant, III,
Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks,
Washington, D.C.

My dear Colonel Grant:

For your information I wish to report that last week I presented to the Fine Arts Commission a detail of the cascade studies for Meridian Hill Park. The question involved was merely the treatment of the receiving pool at the base of the wall fountain, and its relation to the so-called cascade (which in reality is merely a series of basins) and to the connections to the cross walk which parallels the base of the terrace wall. After various alternatives had been suggested, a solution was reached which can not well be described, but which will be covered in the drawings which I hope to submit in the near future.

Incidentally, the question was discussed of the character of the water display in the three niches of the wall fountain. It was recommended that in each case a treatment be developed for falling water in the central niche and jets in the laterals.

I also raised question about a point of planting treatment which I have recently noted with some qualms. If you will refer tothe mall, you will notice that the hedge treatment of the mall stops at the line of the cross walk, and that the oak concert grove comes to the same line. This presents no serious question at the present time, although I have for some time felt a vague dissatisfaction with the abruptness of the cut-off. The question has now clarified itself in my own mind, so that I am disturbed not only by the treatment of the mall itself but by the idea of ultimately having two sorts of background to the long park entrance from 15th Street.

After the discussion, Mr. Vitale went to the park with the other members of the Fine Arts Commission, and subsequently told me that although he did not feel the discrepancy at the present time he was willing to have me go ahead and make a study for an alternative treatment. This I am submitting herewith. It shows a continuation of the main hedge lines to a joint which is sufficient to form a uniform background treatment for the 15th street entrance and at the same time to tie in with the irregularity in design of the treatment around the stairway from the main 16th Street entrance.

This seems to me more logical inside and outside than separating treatments by changing the treatments at the cross axis. It also makes the oak grove more distinctly a part of the concert feature. I suggest that the question be taken up with the Fine Arts Commission again at the next meeting, as indicated by Mr. Vitale. It involves extension of the hedge line and the subatitution of other material for some of the oaks, some of which in turn can be substituted gradually for other oaks which need replacement.

Saturday afternoon I had the pleasure of going with the landscape architects to Meridian Hill, and of showing them the work which has been done and explaining the carrying out of the project. Naturally, there was much discussion of various points of design, not the least of which was the question of the scale of the Joan of Arc statue with the terrace as ultimately developed and directly with the concert feature, which will have to be the focal point of the viata. Later on I will make a further submission in regard to this feature.

Another question which was discussed was that of the mall hedges. I do not know whether it is well understood what the ultimate treatment of these flanking hedges should be. As you know, there are eight niches in these hedges, which I have had in mind for the placement of memorials. It has seemed to me desirable that the character of these memorials should be determined. In Verona, at the Villa Giusti, there is a long avenue accented by various types of obelisks and urns; also in Padua,

in the island center of the Hippodrome, are a number of decorative urns ~~irregularly~~ placed on pedestals. In the main mall at Versailles the accents again are decorative urns. I am loath to see portrait busts or Serenities placed in these niches. It seems to me that a continuity of treatment is desirable. What I believe would be fitting would be decorative urns on pedestals, which perhaps might be given as memorials. This calls attention to the height and size of the urn and the relation in size of the hedge background. The hedges as they stand seem much too low. It seems to me that they should be at least of the bulk of those bordering Montrose Park, although of course trimmed to a definite architectural line. I discussed with the landscape architects present the relative value of raising the heights gradually or of encouraging the hedge to get its full growth; and from the opinions presented I am inclined to believe that it would be better not to continue trimming the hedge to the present low line.

I pass this question on to you for consideration. A copy of this letter is being sent to the Commission of Fine Arts.

Very truly yours,

Horace W. Peaslee.

EXHIBIT F.

*** COPY ***

71st Congress
2d Session.

H. J. RES.

S. J. RES.

RESOLVED BY THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN CONGRESS ASSEMBLED, That the sum of three hundred thousand dollars is hereby authorized to be appropriated to erect in the City of Washington, District of Columbia, a memorial to Pierre Charles L'Enfant, who, under the direction of President Washington, prepared the plan for the capital city of the United States.

Section 2. The site and the design of said memorial shall be subject to the approval of the National Commission of Fine Arts, and of the Joint Committee on the Library.

Section 3. The preparation of the site and the erection of said memorial shall be in charge of the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital, who is hereby authorized to employ artists selected by competition or by direct selection as he may deem most expedient.

EXHIBIT G

71st Congress
2d Session.

[illegible]

[illegible]

RESOLVED BY THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN CONGRESS ASSEMBLED, That the sum of
three hundred thousand dollars is hereby authorized to be appropriated
to erect in the City of Washington, District of Columbia, a memorial
to Pierre Charles L'Enfant, who, under the direction of President
Washington, prepared the plan for the capital city of the United States.

Section 2. The site and the design of said memorial shall be
subject to the approval of the National Commission of Fine Arts, and of
the Joint Committee on the Library.

Section 3. The preparation of the site and the erection of said
memorial shall be in charge of the Director of Public Buildings and
Public Parks of the National Capital, who is hereby authorized to employ
artists selected by competition or by direct selection as he may deem
most expedient.